# THE RACE PROBLEM OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

BY *MARTIN P. NILSSON*
LUND

THE fall of the Roman Empire is the greatest tragedy of history. States have been wiped out and peoples crushed before and since, but the fall of the Roman Empire implied also the fall of the only great and world-wide culture that existed before that to which we belong. Humanity returned to much more primitive conditions of social and economic life, not to speak of education and culture.

Different causes of the rapid disappearance of the glory that was Rome have been sought for. They need not be discussed here. There is more than one cause, and it will be difficult and misleading to reduce them to a single and common formula. That there is also a problem of the biological order was first pointed out by Professor SEECK[1]. His views are an outcome of the typical popular Darwinism of the time in which he wrote. The cruelty and suspiciousness of the emperors removed and killed all persons who, by their mental qualities, capacity, and energy, raised themselves above the average. Through an artificial, inverted selection independence and originality were stamped out and a servile people bred. The possibility of such a process cannot be denied but to attain to any result it would have to be carried out on a large scale and over a protracted period, since the population of the Empire is considered to have amounted to about 100 millions[2]. Proportionally to this, the number of the victims of the emperors' cruelty was very small, and their extinction cannot have had any considerable effect on the stock of the population of the Empire. In reality the thesis of Professor SEECK cannot be maintained. But the problem is there, and I think that it can be approached more safely in the light of modern research.

There are great innate differences between the races of humanity: some have more natural ability than others. Sometimes it has been the fashion to deny this, and to contend that a people with all its peculiarities is the result of its environments, the *milieu,* and the

country. Facts show that this is manifestly erroneous. What was the American continent before its discovery, and what has it become since its occupation by the European peoples? The country around the Hebrus is much the same as that around the Axius, yet the Macedonians created a great empire, while the Thracians were hardly able to form a state at all, although HERODOTUS says that the Thracians and the Indians were the greatest peoples of his time. The natural features of Southern Italy and Sicily are very similar to those of Greece, but the original inhabitants of these countries created no culture; the Greeks brought it to them. The Greek people, not the Greek country, created the culture which is and ever will be the basis of Western civilization [3].

The hereditary dispositions of different races are very different, although we cannot yet grasp these distinctions in detail. There are hereditary dispositions of greater and lesser value. There are dispositions which enable a people to organize a state and create a culture. In ancient times the Greeks and the Romans did this, and only they on a large scale. They were the peoples that created ancient civilization and the Roman Empire; the fate of these depended on them.

I have not here to speak of civic problems or problems of culture. It is well known that the different rights of the inhabitants of the Empire were levelled down, and that the Greco-Roman culture spread throughout all the provinces. The question was whether the Romans were to raise the provincials to their level and assimilate them with themselves or to be assimilated by the provincials, which would include a levelling down of the culture. In the first two centuries the process was in general the former, in the later centuries it was inverted. With this we must not confound the superficial diffusion of the Latin language, which at last embraced the whole of western Europe. For a discussion of this question I refer to my forthcoming book on the Roman Empire [4], and turn now to the biological problem which lies at the basis of the problem of cultures.

If the Romans were to assimilate the provincials with themselves, the foremost condition was a sufficient multiplying of their numbers, i. e. a sufficiently high birth-rate. The Romans had once before carried through a similar task on a smaller scale — the Romanising of Italy. Roman colonies were spread throughout the whole country, the Roman people multiplied in numbers, the almost unlimited supply of soldiers from the colonies gave Rome the victory over the superior genius and strategy of HANNIBAL. After the Social war the kindred

Oscan-Umbrian tribes, and soon afterwards the Celts of the Po valley, were merged in the Roman nation and enlarged and invigorated it. The new task, the Romanising not of a single country but of the Empire, of a world, was gigantic and needed a proportionately increasing birth-rate.

But this scheme failed. We see in our own days how the fall of the birth-rate commences in the upper classes and soon spreads down to the lower. This decline seems to be common to all high culture, at least the same phenomenon appeared among the civilized populations of the Empire, the Greeks and the Romans. As to Greece the statements of POLYBIUS and PLUTARCH are well-known. POLYBIUS says, in the middle of the second century B. C., that childless marriages were common and that the population was diminishing, although neither pestilence nor war had checked the increase. PLUTARCH, at the end of the first century A. D., states that the whole of Greece would not be able to raise the 3,000 soldiers that the little town of Megara had sent to the battle of Salamis.

For Rome and Italy the testimony is abundant that the birth-rate declined during the earlier years of the Empire. In the country the decline reached back into the Republican age, and was connected with agrarian problems. The class of small farmers, from which Rome had once drawn her irresistible armies, was expelled by the formation of great estates cultivated by slaves. This is once of the best known features of that age.

The bonds of matrimony were slackened, the birth and education of children were felt to be burdensome. In ancient times the parents had a right to expose children whom they did not desire to educate. Where the supply of food is scarce among primitive peoples this may be excused. Among a civilized people, when economic egotism has obliterated the natural feelings of the parents, it is nothing but legalized infanticide. This stain on ancient culture, however, did not have any considerable influence on the number of the population. Most of the exposed babies were picked up by slave-hunters; they lived, though in the debased condition of slaves. A more important feature was that the educated classes were decimated in this manner. The ancients also knew other less revolting means of checking the birth-rate, the effect of which may safely be supposed to have been much greater. These expedients are often mentioned in the medical literature of the period, and many seem to have looked on them as some extreme feminists do to-day [5].

A curious circumstance shows how common childlessness was among the upper classes. This was the competition for inheritances, which the moralists satirized and thundered against in vain. It was not only a literary commonplace but a very real evil. The philosopher SENECA writes to a mother who had lost her only son that in these times childlessness contributes to the importance of a person rather than deprives him of it. Even the legislation was put in action against the annoyance [6].

Much more important are the legal means used to raise the birth-rate. The first emperor, AUGUSTUS, in spite of an embittered resistance, enacted the famous laws which enforced every Roman of noble birth between 25 and 60 years to be married, or at least engaged [7]. The irony of fate willed that both the consuls who gave the law their names were unmarried. Parents of three and more children had valuable prerogatives, especially in regard to the higher offices in the state. Unmarried persons were deprived of the privilege of visiting the circus and the theatres and could not receive legacies, childless legatees were deprived of half their inheritance. These means were more drastic than any that have been imagined in our times, but they were of no avail.

The decline of the birth-rate begins in the upper classes, and AUGUSTUS had perhaps thought that if it could be checked there the example would influence the lower classes. But he also tried to support poor families with a flourishing crowd of children. He used to present them with 1,000 sesterces for every child. An inscription of the small town of Atina in Latium recounts that a certain BASILA has given to the town a fund of 400,000 sesterces in order that the children of the inhabitants may receive corn for their food and at the age of puberty a sum of 1,000 sesterces each to set them up in life. This is the first example of the means by which the emperors later on tried to raise the birth-rate of the people in Italy. In reality it is liberating the parents from the cost of feeding the children and transferring this to public funds. The emperors NERVA and TRAJAN in particular carried out this scheme on a large scale, and patriotic private persons helped them with great gifts. PLINY the younger, for example, gave half a million sesterces to his native town of Comum for this purpose. The later emperors of the second century vigorously carried out the work and created a staff of supervising officers [8]. It must be acknowledged that those in authority recognized the evil and did their utmost to check it. In proportion to the finances of the

time, the use of these funds which were destined to raise the birth-rate of the Roman population is the greatest social measure that history records. It failed, however. In the hardships of the third century the funds diminished and finally disappeared.

In some cases it is possible to show whence the men came who took the places of the Roman elements of the population. The old Roman nobility had been severely dealt with in the proscriptions at the end of the Republic. AUGUSTUS tried earnestly to save what was left, but without success. The old families died out in the first century A. D.[9]. The correspondents of PLINY the younger do not bear the old famous names. In their stead provincials enter the senate, at first from the most Romanised provinces, Southern Spain (Baetica), South-East France (Gallia Narbonensis), later on from Africa (Tunis), and Asia Minor. The first consuls who originated from Spain appear in the last years of the Republic and were followed by several others during the first century A. D., the first consul from Gallia Narbonensis is found in the reign of TIBERIUS, the first from Africa and Syria in the reigns of VESPASIAN and DOMITIAN respectively. From TRAJAN onwards even the emperors were provincials. TRAJAN and his successor HADRIAN were Spaniards, ANTONINUS PIUS belonged to a Gallic and MARCUS AURELIUS to a Spanish family, SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS was a native of Africa, his successors were Syrians. It was difficult for a man belonging to the Greek portion of the Empire to attain a high position, because a knowledge of Latin and Roman law was needed for this, and such a knowledge was not common in the East, which prided itself on its own ancient culture. Nevertheless after the reign of HADRIAN numbers of Orientals appear in high places; the western world seems almost to be worn out.

The army was not great in proportion to the population of the Empire — in the first two centuries about 300,000 men, while the inhabitants of the Empire are considered to have amounted to 70—100 millions — but it played a very important part in the shifting of the population. In the order created by AUGUSTUS half the army, the legions, was to be recruited among the Roman citizens, the other half, the so-called auxiliary troops, among the provincials, who after their discharge received the citizenship. In this manner many provincials and their descendants became Roman citizens. AUGUSTUS determined that the legions were to be recruited from Italy and the oldest colonies of Roman citizens in the provinces, and the *élite* troops — the praetorians — from certain districts of middle Italy, which had pre-

served the purest Roman blood. This principle, however, could not be maintained. In the first century more and more citizens from the provinces penetrated into the legions, and recruits from all parts of Italy were found among the praetorians. The old recruiting districts became more and more deficient. HADRIAN inverted the principle as to the recruiting of the legions: from his time they were recruited from the districts where they camped, i. e. the borders of the Empire, where civilization, except for what was brought by the army, was at its lowest. SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS dissolved the old Italian body of praetorians and created a new one recruited from the legions. In this manner the army was barbarized and in the third century the way to any leading post was through the army [10]. From the time of MAXIMINUS THRAX the emperors were barbarians, many of them Illyrians; in all probability they belonged to the refractory people that we know in our time as Albanians. They turned the Empire upside-down in the third century, but the vigour of these emperors did at last create order. The lack of recruits, however, was not due entirely to the diminishing number of the civilized population: here the deep-rooted pacificism of the age also made itself felt; but it vigorously contributed to the immixture of barbarians and provincials in the governing classes. From the time of DIOCLETIAN the best bodies of troops were recruited from the Germans within and without the borders of the Empire.

The mixed character of the population of the capital is attested by many ancient authors. We can hardly imagine the extent of the admixture; only Constantinople, the most cosmopolitan city of the world, can give us an idea of it. CICERO calls Rome a city created by the confluence of the nations, four centuries later the emperor CONSTANTIUS wondered at the haste with which all the peoples flowed together to Rome. LUCAN, the poet and friend of NERO, says that Rome was populated not by its own citizens but by the scum of the world. The Oriental element seems to have been very conspicuous. A famous passage in JUVENAL states that the poet cannot like this Graecised Rome, but that the least part of the scum is composed of Greeks: the Syrian Orontes has flowed into the Tiber, with foreign languages and foreign manners.

The Jewish population was considerable. In the year 4 B. C. it is said that 8,000 Jews accompanied a deputation to the Emperor. TIBERIUS turned them out and deported 4,000 to Sardinia, but when CLAUDIUS some years later wished to do the same, they had become

so numerous that the plan could not be carried out. In the eastern provinces the Jews were very numerous, in Egypt they are considered to have amounted to the eighth or seventh part of the population, in Cyrenaica and Cyprus they were killed by hundreds of thousands in the pogroms, in Asia Minor and Southern Italy they were numerous, in Africa, Spain, and Southern France not few. But after the fall of Jerusalem and the great rebellion in the reign of HADRIAN the Jews separated themselves from the rest of the population; hence their importance in the mixture of the races was not so great.

In ancient times the Jews were not merchants and bankers as now. This position was occupied by the Syrians. In the last two centuries B. C. we find many Italian merchants in the East. They were especially bankers and slave- and corn-merchants, and their trade depended on the power of Rome. But when the abuses in the provinces were repressed by the emperors, the Italians disappeared and their places were taken by the provincials. The real merchants were the Syrians, who had important factories in Italy and who appear in every province. They were numerous e. g. in Gaul, where even in the sixth century they were organized into separate Christian churches, at least in Paris and Orleans. SALVIAN mentions the hosts of Syrian merchants who have inundated all the towns and think only of lies and falsehood. The merchants of Italy were not Romans by birth. They were enfranchised slaves, who in this manner had obtained the citizenship [11].

The enfranchisement of slaves is a very important cause of the alteration of the population; it took place on a large scale. It was a point of honour for a noble or wealthy Roman to enfranchise his slaves, at least when he made his will. AUGUSTUS regulated the enfranchisement. The number of slaves which it was permitted to enfranchise was regulated according to the number of slaves which a man possessed, but was in no case permitted to exceed one hundred. The freedmen were in a socially inferior position, but their descendants attained the full citizenship and their grandsons might even become senators. A discussion that took place in the senate in the reign of NERO is very illuminating. It was said that the enfranchised slaves were numerous, they crowded the tribuses and the inferior positions in the state, most of the knights and many of the senators were descendants of freedmen. If the freedmen were turned out, there would be a lack of free citizens.

The freedmen formed a very important part of the population in the earlier centuries of the Empire. It is a burning question whence they originated. A preliminary matter is, which slaves were enfranchised? Those, naturally, who personally attended on their masters and had charge of his business. The slaves of the farms were not valued much more than the beasts of burden and had little better prospect of being enfranchised. For attending on the master and managing his business no mere barbarians were fit; some civilization, such as was found among the able Orientals, was required.

An examination of the statements of the inscriptions concerning the nationalities of the slaves shows that this is true. They corroborate the old saying that the Syrians were a people of born slaves. Most numerous after the Syrians are the Graecised inhabitants of Asia Minor and the Jews. More than half the workers of the Italian potteries have Greek or Oriental names [12], and the names of the artisans of other crafts convey the same impression. Next in numerical importance come the Egyptians and Ethiopians, but in the case of these peoples the external differences were so great that they never became so perilous as the other races mentioned. In Europe no people was predestined to slavery, although some, but not many, slaves originated from European countries. The barbarians of Europe went into the army instead. For instance only two Pannonians are mentioned as slaves, but men of this race crowded into the army [13]. The importation of slaves and the enfranchisement brought in Orientals more especially, and to this fact is largely due the orientalism which is a prominent feature of the later Empire.

There is yet another source for the alteration of the folk-stock, which did not have such an immediate effect as the enfranchisement of slaves but which must in the end have been of considerable importance, viz. the transplantation of whole tribes from beyond the northern frontiers into the Empire. AUGUSTUS' general, AGRIPPA, had already transplanted the German Ubii from the right to the left bank of the Rhine. Some years later 40,000 Sugambrians and Swebians were settled in Gaul, and 50,000 Dacians were brought from the districts north of the Danube into Thracia. In the reign of NERO great hosts with chiefs, wives, and children — it is said to the number of 100,000 — were brought over the frontier from the same districts. When MARCUS AURELIUS had conquered the Marcomannians and the Quades he settled those peoples in great masses in the Empire — in Dacia, Pannonia, Mysia, the Roman Germany, and even in Italy.

These settlers did not attain to the citizenship; they became something like serfs and in a later age contributed considerably to the army.

Professor SEECK contends that this invasion of Germans caused an important change [14]. The western part of the Empire was Germanised and the birth-rate commenced to increase, he says. In the wars of the third century there is never any mention of a deficiency of recruits, as in former times. He refers to the description of the Gauls by AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS in the fourth century to show that they were Germanised; they were well able to fight, had blue eyes, fair hair and complexion, and were of high stature. But our ideas of the Celts are contrary to the ancient testimonies [15]. As long as the government desired to recruit the army from the civilized population, there was a lack of recruits; that the recruiting should be difficult in the great wars of MARCUS AURELIUS is comprehensible, since pestilence ravaged the Empire. As soon as the emperors determined to recruit the army from the provincials (Pannonians, Illyrians, Africans etc.) there was no lack of recruits. In older times a very small minimum height is given for the recruits, 1,48 m.; in 367 A. D. on the contrary a very high one, 1,63 m., and this is believed to demonstrate a change in the supply of recruits. But the former figure refers to voluntary recruits, of which there was no surplus in these times, the latter to such recruits as landed proprietors had to deliver from their serfs. They were no less anxious to furnish as bad men as possible than the government to get the best men. There is no evidence for a swift change of blood, but the importance of the Germans that were transplanted into the Empire is not to be underestimated. They formed a strong addition to the barbarian population and paved the way for the German occupation at the end of the Empire.

What has been set forth as to this point may convey the impression that an inverted selection took place, and in reality there was something like it. The peoples that had created the ancient culture and the Roman Empire diminished in number, and the gaps were filled up by provincials. This process led to a sinking of the culture, in proportion as the less civilized provincials ousted the old citizens, and lessened the coherence of the Empire, which depended on the people that had created it. But this problem we have not to consider here. The process concerns us directly in so far as the old races were ousted by races of lesser value. This fact may have been of importance, but in view of their later history it is risky to contend that the Semites and the Germans were less able races, and

from these two peoples came the main streams which changed the stock of the population.

The crucial problem is another and is one that is contained within the Empire itself to a far greater extent than may have appeared up to this point. The Roman Empire was a motley of different peoples, races, and languages. This fact has been somewhat obscured because in the West the old languages were ousted by the Latin and died without leaving traces (except the Basque). But this is a superficial matter. The races themselves persisted and took part in the mixing of the peoples, although they changed their languages. It is of the first importance to form a concrete idea of how manifold and deep and great the differences were [16].

At the commencement of the Empire the population of Italy seemed to be rather homogeneously Roman. It had been Romanised during the last centuries of the Republic, but the old races had not died out, they added their contribution to the population. The Oscan-Umbrian tribes were very closely akin to the Romans and they spoke dialects of the same language, but there were once many other peoples in Italy of different races, in the north Celts, in the north-east and south-east Illyrian tribes, in the south Greeks, besides many native tribes, Oenotrians, Sicanians, Siculians, etc., about whose race we know nothing. The Etruscans played an important part but they are yet an unsolved riddle. The art shows that they had a very marked and peculiar physical type. We can read their language but cannot understand it, all attempts to connect it with any other language having failed; the language died out at the commencement of the Empire. In N. W. Italy and S. E. Gaul we find the great people of the Ligurians, which up to the imperial age preserved in some parts its liberty and its very primitive mode of living. The Ligurian language is lost, the connexions of this people with other races, if it had any, are unknown [17]. The most probable view is that the Ligurians were the original inhabitants of these districts, and were supplanted by the Celts who invaded the Po valley about 400 B. C. Certain students have tried to show that the type of the people and the language of the once Ligurian districts preserve some peculiarities which are supposed to be the last traces of this extinguished race.

Gaul, i. e. France and the Po valley, was so called after the ruling race, the Gauls, who are also called Celts. During ancient times Celtic was the common language of the inhabitants and was spoken even by the noble families. IRENAEUS had to preach in Celtic in

Lyons, about 200 A. D.; it was permitted to use Celtic in writing wills. The language survived at least into the fifth century. The Gauls had to learn Latin with toil and labour.

In France too the Celts were conquering immigrants, who had settled more especially north of the central mountainous region. In the south-eastern parts lived the Ligurians, in the south-western the Iberians. This is another non-Aryan people whose riddle is unsolved, but it seems as though the Iberians were the original inhabitants of these parts of France and Spain. Small Celtic hosts had penetrated into Spain, mixed up with the Iberians, and formed the Celtiberian tribes. In north-western Spain there still survives the Basque language, the only remnant of the pre-Aryan languages of Europe. Its grammatical structure and vocabulary differ totally from those of other languages. It is tempting to connect it with the Iberian language, but the Iberian inscriptions, although not interpreted, do not seem to corroborate this supposition. Hence some students have referred the Basques to the Ligurians, who perhaps also inhabited parts of Spain, others have tried to connect Basque with the Berber language, but the Ligurians are, as to the language, an unknown quantity and the connexion with the Berbers is not warranted by evident facts.

In the British Isles the Celts are immigrants. Consequently we may expect to find here considerable remnants of the older aboriginal inhabitants. Such were e. g. the wild Picts of Scotland, whom the Romans never subjugated. There is a great difference between the two peoples that still speak Celtic languages — the Irish, who often have fair complexions, and the usually small and swarthy Welsh. The supposition at once arises that the Welsh are Celts in language only, and not in race. This theory has been advanced by English scholars, who have tried to find further connexions, e. g. with the Iberians and the native races of North Africa, but without any very certain evidence [18]. The theory is of course opposed to the common idea that the Celts were a swarthy people of small stature, but this is an inference from the modern Frenchman, who is held to be the real descendant of the ancient Celts. It conflicts with all testimonies of ancient literature and art. If we desire to know the physical type of the ancient Celts we must needs follow these indications, and they show unanimously that the Celtic type was much more akin to the Teutonic — blue eyes, fair complexion and hair, high stature, and a ferocious mind. If facts are to speak it must be admitted that the Celtic type in France generally was merged in the original inhabitants, and this is only

natural. It is the usual fate of an invading, conquering people, even if they are able to impose their language on the conquered.

Celtic tribes had also penetrated into Pannonia and the Balkan peninsula, but were too few to acquire very much importance. The inhabitants of Pannonia seem to have been chiefly Illyrians. In Dacia and the eastern Balkan peninsula lived the Getans or Dacians, who belonged to the Aryan race, although they never had any considerable historical importance. Our information here is more than usually scanty and does not admit of any suppositions as to the older inhabitants who may have lived in these countries.

The remaining province of the western part, Africa, is better known. The Punic language survived during the imperial age. Most of the hearers of St. AUGUSTINE understood Punic: it was spoken by the peasants. The church had its difficulties with their language; no one was readily made a bishop who did not know Punic. In the interior lived the Berber tribes, who still retain their peculiar language and racial type.

In the East the position is simple and clear, except in the case of Asia Minor. In Egypt and the Semitic Orient the Greek culture and language had never been more than a thin varnish that was soon worn off. The ethnology of Asia Minor was extremely mixed. No land had been exposed to invaders to such a degree as this [10]. The Empire of the Hittites had been crushed in the twelfth century B. C. by invading Aryan tribes, the Phrygians, but the race survived. It is supposed that it was merged into the Armenians and perhaps partly into the Jews. Lydians, Carians, and Lycians have left inscriptions. An attempt has been made to connect the language of the last-named with the Aryan languages, but with doubtful success. The Lydian language seems to be distinct from others [20]. Later on other Aryan tribes had invaded the land, Thracians in the commencement of the first millennium B. C., and Celts in the middle of the third century B. C. The interior of the country was called Galatia after them. The Hellenising was wide-spread, but in spite of this the old languages survived more vigorously than is generally surmised, and this is also an evidence for the subsisting of the old races. The Mysians, who seem to have been a mixture of Thracians and Lydians, still spoke their own language in the beginning of the fifth century A. D. So also did the famous Isaurian robber tribes at the end of the sixth. The same was the case in Lycaonia; the Phrygian language survived at least into the fifth century [21]. The surface seems to be

Greek, but underneath great racial differences survived, which found an expression in the Christian sects of Asia Minor; their stronghold was the native population of the country.

Our information is scanty and the research is difficult, but the broad outlines which have been sketched above will be sufficient to convey a concrete idea not only of how many races, peoples, and languages were contained in the Roman Empire, but also of how radically different most of them were [22]. Modern Europe is apt to give an erroneous impression. Except for a few unimportant peoples of other races (Finns, Hungarians, Turks and a few others) it seems to present the image of an Aryan population that is separated into different peoples but has sprung from the same source. This is true only as to the languages. The kindred languages cover great racial differences, although new races have developed from the ancient blend of races. The very vivid discussion on the origin and splitting up of the Aryan tongue has obscured the comprehension of the older racial status of Europe. The leading idea is (at least unconsciously) that of an ancient original unity that was differentiated and split up. In the case of the original inhabitants of Europe we must instead of a unity imagine a multiplicity of different races and languages; the latter were ousted by the language of the invading Aryan tribes and died, the races were seemingly merged in their conquerors. The victorious spreading of the Aryan languages put an end to the multiplicity of earlier languages — e. g. Etruscan, Ligurian, Iberian, etc. — and introduced Aryan languages that were kindred with one another. This process was strongly advanced during the Empire; S. W. Europe, which up to this time had spoken non-Aryan tongues, was assimilated. But the enigmatical Basque language still survives as a reminder of what has once been.

It is in this light that the racial problem of the Roman Empire is to be viewed. As long as the peoples of western Europe lived in their old primitive and independent condition the status was rather stable. The Greek colonists were few and the peoples on whose shores they had founded their towns were often openly hostile to them. In Italy the Latin and Oscan-Umbrian tribes pushed out the original inhabitants more and more. The connexions with Greece and the Orient were few. The invading Celtic tribes brought disturbance, but these tribes settled in certain districts. In S. W. France and most of Spain the old races were not disturbed. The invasion must

however have involved a certain mixing up of the races, and this is testified by the name of the Celtiberians. But the culture was little developed, the intercourse was rare, the intruders were not able to absorb the old races, they consolidated themselves within somewhat narrower frontiers. The tribes were independent and hostile to each other. This would have prevented a mixing up of the races on a larger scale, even if the conditions for such a mixing up had existed at all.

Such were the conditions introduced by the Roman Empire. The peace of the Roman emperor, imposed by the Roman government, wiped out the old frontiers. The different tribes were subjected to the same administration and the same culture was opened to them all. The excellent Roman roads favoured the intercourse, while culture, trade, and the needs of the Empire increased it. The mixing up of the different races and peoples of the Empire was begun and increased by all the causes which make the inhabitants of a civilized state move from one part of it to another. What some of these causes were we have shown in the foregoing pages. The men who in former times had lived and died and propagated their kind within the frontiers of their own people were mixed up, as it were, in a great bowl as wide as the limits of the Empire, and peoples from beyond the frontiers were thrown into the same vessel. This is the fundamental fact the importance and consequences of which we have to consider.

It may be said that the problem was whether the less civilized peoples should be merged in the civilized — the Romans and the Greeks, to whom the culture and coherence of the Empire were due — or whether the civilized were to be absorbed by the less civilized. As we have seen, the circumstances were not favourable. The effects upon civilization were very important: the bankruptcy of the civilization and sinking of the general level of culture in the hardships and wars of the bad third century destroyed much more than all the cruelties of the emperors. But it is not our task here to investigate this point. The mixing up of the races involves not only a problem for civilization but also a biological problem, and to this we must now return. I think it may be understood in the new light of recent researches on genetics.

The species man is extremely variable, being surpassed in this respect by only a very few other species. Each race is the product of a historical development, although the history of its development belongs to a time past long ago, which has never been recorded. The

condition for the developing of a race is that a group of men, who may be counted in hundreds or in millions, shall live for a considerable time in at least relative isolation, so that foreign disturbing elements are kept out. If it be supposed that this group originally contained a motley mixture of internal and external dispositions, the natural conditions under the sway of which the group lives will be favourable for some of these dispositions and unfavourable for others. The natural conditions have the same effect as the conscious interference of a breeder trying to produce a certain race of some species of animals, although more slowly and not to the same extent. The effect will be stronger in proportion to the smallness of the group and the intensity of inbreeding. The outcome of this selection depends much more on the dispositions which originally existed and which in the development of the race attain to ascendency than on the external *milieu*. Why some races are excellently adapted to the natural conditions of life of their country and are yet unable to achieve a higher political and intellectual development, and why on the other hand other races are able to create a culture and a political organization is a riddle which is concealed in the darkest riddle of all, the human mind, the variability of intelligence and volition, for these too are properties which vary with the race. It is only that we cannot grasp them definitely.

Primitive conditions are favourable to this breeding of races. The population is thin and split up into small groups. Intercourse is rare. The tribes are hostile or at least foreign to each other and occupy each a definite district. A fact of profound importance for the development of society and races is the claim to possess the district in which the tribe lives; this seems to be founded in the nature of man, as well of some species of animals. Foreigners who penetrate into the district of the tribe will be expelled or killed. The tribe maintains its purity from foreign elements until the advance of culture introduces slavery, which is first applied to the women. In primitive conditions this occasion of the mixing of the races is of no great extent or importance. Neighbouring tribes are often kindred.

Under primitive conditions we have consequently to expect a multiplicity of characteristically different races, although the differing capacity of different races to maintain themselves in the struggle for life and the combats against other races causes a certain race to spread itself over a wider territory, while the migrations which originate in over-population and an innate desire to wander introduce a foreign

race into a country. If we take these two circumstances into account, we have the status of Europe and Africa before the Roman conquest. In Africa we find Berbers and the immigrant Punics, in western Europe Iberians, Ligurians, the immigrant Celts, and plenty of other races of whom we have no sufficient knowledge. The ethnology of Italy seems to be more varied; our information is here richer. Apart from the old inhabitants and the immigrant Aryans there were the enigmatical Etruscans, who cannot be connected with any other people. The Balkan-peninsula and the countries south of the Danube were inhabited by Aryans and perhaps by remnants of an older population. Asia Minor was from very ancient times a melting-pot for many different races. Syria was inhabited by Semitic tribes which the policy of the Assyrians had transplanted and mixed up. In Egypt the old stable race preserved itself, but the mixing up with the foreign masters of the land and immigrants here also caused a mingling of races which may possibly have been an important factor in the trouble and decline at the end of antiquity.

When under the shelter of Roman peace and Roman administration all these races — those mentioned are only the most important of the races known — were mingled with each other, the result was an unlimited bastardizing. Bastardizing conveys perils which cosmopolitanism did not acknowledge but which modern science has shown to be real. The race is a group of men with definite hereditary dispositions which through the above described natural selection have become to a certain degree firm and fixed. There are races of more and lesser value. Bastardizing between two races which differ from each other to more than a certain degree results in the deterioration of the race, at least viewed from the standpoint of the better of the two. The aversion to mixed marriages, e. g. to marriages between Europeans and negroes, is consequently just from a genetic point of view. The danger is yet more insidious if the races are on the one hand so different that the bastardizing involves the peril of a deterioration of the race, but on the other hand do not differ so much in externals that the aversion to mixed marriages makes itself felt. This aversion is however a very feeble defence against the mixing up of races, and its strength depends on the mind of the age.

The crossing of races, through which a better race is superseded by a worse, is however neither the only peril nor the greatest. A race that is at least to a certain degree pure is physically and psychically a fixed type, which precisely through the firmness and fixedness

of its dispositions is able to create something to which its dispositions predispose it. If these dispositions are of such a kind as to enable the race to achieve a higher culture or to organize a state, as was the case among the Greeks and Romans, the result will be a certain form of culture and of state, moulded according to fixed laws and customs of life. The result of the bastardizing will be a motley blend of the different hereditary dispositions of the races which are crossed. Mere chance brings different dispositions of different races together in almost infinitely varying fashions. But this does not suffice. Dispositions which were formerly concealed, lying latent in one or the other of the crossed races, will appear on the surface and make the product of the crossing yet more motley and incalculable. The unity and harmony of the race and the individual will be destroyed, the personality loses its balance. The individuals which are born out of this crossing fail to achieve a firm and fixed type. Psychically they lack a definite direction and vacillate indecisively between conflicting and unconnected hereditary dispositions. They may often possess great intelligence, but the moral strength is wanting. This state of affairs is due to biological factors but gets still worse if — as was the case in the Roman Empire — the fixed form of the mental life at the same time breaks down and is transformed.

Bastard races have a bad reputation. If Levantines, Eurasians, Mestizes etc. are mentioned everyone feels how deep-rooted is the objection against them. People are wont to say that this bad reputation and the moral weakness of the bastards are due to the unfavourable conditions in which they are born and bred, usually as illegitimate and neglected children, disowned by the kinsfolk of both father and mother. But this is not the full explanation, it is only superficial; at the root lies the destroying effect of the bastardizing on the personality. The Roman Empire became more and more filled by bastards. The bastardizing was strongest in the ruling country, Italy, whither people from all the borders of the Empire flowed together, and was stronger in the upper civilized classes than in the lower, which did not move about with the same frequency [23]. But the army, the trade, and the general intercourse carried the bastardizing into every corner of the Empire. The swiftness of the process is not to be wondered at. Contrary to the slow development of a race, the bastardizing shows its effects even in the first generation, but is of course increased by the crossing of the bastards. Whether it is to set its stamp on the people will depend solely on the extent

of the process, and it has been shown that in the Roman Empire it was carried out on the largest scale.

A bastardizing to this extent results in the mingling of better and worse races into a motley and indefinite mass without firm mental or moral characteristics. This is a sufficient explanation of the decline and fall of the ancient culture and the Roman Empire. But even if the bastardizing and mixing up of the races leads by its immediate effects to chaos, this is not the ultimate result. New races may emerge from the chaos and be able to reconstruct that which was destroyed. We know the conditions for such a development. They are that the bastardizing shall cease and the people shall be isolated so that the mixture gets its chance and has time to become settled and purified. In this way are given the conditions for developing a new race from the motley blend, the nature of which depends on the circumstances.

The above-mentioned conditions were realised at the commencement of ancient history. The ancient culture peoples, the Greeks and the Romans, invaded their countries from without and settled themselves among peoples of foreign races. The Greeks and the Romans of history are a product of a blending of races. Our knowledge of the Romans is very scanty. If the oldest population of Rome was a blend of Latins and Sabines, that does not matter much, because these tribes were already very closely akin. But it is certain that the Etruscans held sway over Rome some time towards the end of the period of the kings, and their culture exercised a profound influence on the city. They lived next-door, on the other bank of the Tiber, and it may be supposed with certainty that the Romans had a considerable admixture of Etruscan blood.

Greece is better known than Italy and her history enables us to follow the process more closely. Recent discoveries have revealed to us the wonderfully high culture of the early and middle second millennium B. C., which is known as the Minoan and Mycenaean culture. It is certain that the people which created this culture was not Aryan; it was perhaps akin to some peoples of Asia Minor, though others maintain that its kinsfolk are to be found in northern Egypt. The invading Aryan tribes, the Greeks, settled among the original inhabitants of Greece in the same second millennium and at last destroyed the old culture. The centuries between the decay of the Mycenaean culture and the commencement of the historical age are a blank. We know only that the culture was utterly debased. The small di-

stricts of Greece were isolated from each other. This is shown by the geometrical style of vase-painting which belongs to the ninth and eighth centuries B. C. The Mycenaean style of vase-painting is the same wherever Mycenaean vases are found, in or outside of Greece. The geometrical style, on the contrary, has very characteristic differences: it is quite easy to say in which island or province a vase or even a sherd has been made. The ancient towns were small, the district was very limited, and the inhabitants were not very numerous. Each of these towns was wholly independent and sovereign, composing a state with its own rights. The bitterest enemy was usually the neighbour. In this narrow frame the people lived and — married. Consequently inbreeding was the rule and was strongly accentuated by the smallness of the population. In Athens at a somewhat later age the law enforced it; nobody could become a citizen if both his parents were not citizens of the town. This isolation and inbreeding created the race to which ancient culture and the foundations of our own culture are due. Italy, which at last conquered the world and organized the Empire, underwent much the same process.

The process was repeated, but on a larger scale, after the decay of the ancient culture and the fall of the Roman Empire and the settling down of the foreign conquerors in its provinces. Letters and education, as far as they survived at all, were limited to very few. The decay of the material civilization changed and fettered the lives even of the poorest classes. We may compare the ages e. g. of HADRIAN and of the Merovingians in order to perceive this. Intercourse ceased. The old Roman roads, on which the peoples of the Empire had penetrated into all parts of it, fell into disuse, were broken up, treated as quarries, or became overgrown by herbs and woods. Society was split up into small independent and self-supporting unities, — this is the feudal system — the inhabitants were rooted fast in the soil. So there reappeared the primitive conditions under which every man takes his wife at his own doors. In this isolation of the small groups new races and new peoples developed out of the mixed human chaos of the Empire during the Middle Ages. These are the peoples of modern Europe, and the outcome of their racial instincts is seen in the national states of modern Europe, whose frontiers form to some degree an effective barrier against a race-blending of such a destructive character as that which was the most active cause of the decay of ancient culture and the fall of the Roman Empire. The Nemesis of history has caused the consequences of victory to be

fatal to the victors, who have been merged and lost in the broad masses of the conquered races.

---

## NOTES.

[1] O. SEECK, *Geschichte des Unterganges der antiken Welt,* I, the chapter »Die Ausrottung der Besten».

[2] K. J. BELOCH, *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt.*

[3] K. J. BELOCH, *Griechische Geschichte,* I: $1^2$, p. 66.

[4] MARTIN P:N NILSSON, *Den romerska kejsartiden,* II, ch. 4.

[5] J. ILBERG, *Zur gynäkologischen Ethik der Griechen,* Archiv für Religionswissenschaft XIII (1910) 1 sqq.

[6] L. FRIEDLÄNDER, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms,* $I^8$, pp. 419 sqq.

[7] The *lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus* and the *lex Papia Poppaea.*

[8] For references see e. g. the article Alimenta in PAULY-WISSOWA, *Realencyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.*

[9] M. GELZER, *Die Nobilität der Kaiserzeit,* Hermes L (1915) 395 sqq.

[10] A. v. DOMASZEWSKI, *Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres,* Bonner Jahrbücher 117 (1918). — H. DESSAU, *Die Herkunft der Offiziere und Beamten des römischen Kaiserreiches,* Hermes XLV (1910) 1 sqq.

[11] V. PARVAN, *Die Nationalität der Kaufleute im römischen Kaiserreich,* Dissertation, Breslau, 1909.

[12] H. GUMMERUS, *Romerska krukmakarstämplar,* Eranos XVI (1916) 176.

[13] M. BANG, *Die Herkunft der römischen Sklaven,* Rheinisches Museum XXV (1910) 225 sqq.; *Nachtrag,* ibid. XXVII (1912) 189 sqq.

[14] SEECK, *loc. cit.* pp. 385 sqq.

[15] See, p. 380.

[16] The old standard work is H. D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE, *Les premiers habitants de l'Europe*$^2$ (1889). For a more recent review see H. HIRTH, *Die Indogermanen* I pp. 34 sqq.

[17] Some authors, following D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE, take the view that the Ligurians were an Aryan people, but the evidence adduced is exceedingly slight.

[18] See e. g. J. BEDDOE, *The Races of Britain.*

[19] See my paper *Den stora folkvandringen i det andra årtusendet f. Kr.* in Ymer 1912, pp. 455 sqq. On the languages of Asia Minor P. KRETSCHMER, *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache,* pp. 289 sqq

[20] *Sardis,* Publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis, vol. VI, *Lydian Inscriptions,* by ENNO LITTMANN.

[21] K. HOLL, *Das Fortleben der Volkssprachen in Kleinasien in nachchristlicher Zeit,* Hermes XLII (1908) 240 sqq.

[22] The anthropological school of Professor SERGI, RIPLEY and others has tried to show that there existed in Europe from very old times three races: the fair, dolichocephalic Northern race, the dark-haired, grey-eyed, and brachycephalic Alpine race, the dark-haired, dolichocephalic Mediterranean race, and that, in spite of all invasions and crossings, these races still maintain themselves in their respective districts. I cannot discuss this theory here, it would also imply a

discussion of the question as to what is to be understood by »race». (For my views as to this point see my above-cited paper in Ymer 1912, pp. 465 sqq). There are races with varying degrees of racial differences. I wish only to point out that the above-mentioned theory may not be inconsistent with the view that is advanced here. The signs by which these three races are recognized are purely physical. Here it is in the first place a question of psychical differences. It may be that the physical properties have persisted on the whole but that the psychical ones have changed in the formation of the new races which have developed from the blending of the races in Europe.

[23] Cp. the dates given above (pp. 384 sqq.) for the provincial origin of emperors and senators.